

Remarks

By the present amendment, Claims 1-55 have been cancelled, and new Claims 56-57 have been added. Claim 56 is the only independent claim.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 34-38 and 43-50 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Published Application No. 2001/0037313 (Lofgren). The cancellation of these claims makes this rejection moot.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 6-16, 39-42, and 51-55 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in the light of U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0035685 (Ono) in view of Lofgren. The cancellation of these claims makes this rejection moot.

New Claims

The Applicant has added new Claims 56-57, each reciting features that are not disclosed within the cited art.

Claim 56 recites that the first processing device has a plurality of compartments for storing information. The first processing device and interface are structured so that the interface receives communication from less than all of the compartments, and resists communication from the remaining compartments. Claim 57 further recites that the first processing device and interface include contents structured to interface with each other to permit reading from a desired compartment, while resisting reading from other compartments. These features provide the advantage that multiple types of information may be stored on the first processing device, in a manner that allows the information to be selectively released only to specific individuals, while

guarding the remainder of the information from being released to those same individuals. For example, a first processing device containing drivers' license information, criminal history information, social security information, financial information, and medical information may be structured to interface with an interface device operated by a law enforcement officer, providing a law enforcement officer with access to the drivers' license and criminal history information, while resisting access to the remainder of the information. Likewise, a doctor having a different interface may be granted access to the medical information while viewing the financial or criminal history information is resisted. The specification describes these features at paragraphs 26, 57 (page 24, last three bullet points) 61 (pages 30-31, advantages 4 and 5), 63 (page 33, 3-4 lines up from the bottom of the page) 66, 72, and 84.

Ono discloses an intermediary device having a management table for storing security information such as server authentication, client authentication, encryption and decryption keys, and information about a session between the server and the client. In some embodiments, the intermediary may obtain diligent and destination address information from a client hello message during a handshake procedure. Subsequent messages may be checked as having corresponding origin and destination addresses. Subsequent messages may also be checked to determine if a certification accompanying a message is valid. The intermediary may then transmit the message along with an authentication message or an alert message, depending on the validity of the certification. Other embodiments may encrypt or decrypt a message prior to sending the message. All embodiments of Ono, however, are directed towards authenticating a message, not towards providing access to a portion of information while resisting access to another portion of information. Instead, all messages that are properly authenticated are transmitted by the system of Ono. Ono

therefore fails to teach or suggest each and every element of Claims 56-57.

Lofgren discloses a digital watermarking system wherein a document such as a credit card is verified by capturing an image of a watermark on a document to confirm that an individual attempting to use the document in a transaction has physical possession of the document at the time of the transaction. Data such as a document identification or document-type identifier may be extracted from the watermark. Alternatively, the watermark may be subjected to a hash algorithm, and then compared with a database of all other hashes of all other watermarks received. The same watermark will not have identical hashes due to position and orientation changes with respect to the camera or other image-capture device, lighting, etc., so a match indicates that a previous image was captured and played back by a hacker. Additional verification information, such as a password, personal identification number, retina scan, voice recognition, or biometric verification, may also be used. However, Lofgren is limited to authenticating the authenticity and physical possession of a document prior to engaging in a transaction, and does not teach or suggest any means to selectively provide and resist access to different portions of information stored on the documents. Lofgren therefore fails to supplement Ono in a manner which would produce the elements recited in Claims 56-57.

Therefore, Claims 56-57 are respectfully submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, the Application is respectfully submitted to be in condition for allowance. If such is not the case, the Examiner has invited to telephone Applicant's representative so that any additional issues may be resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

William F. Lang IV

William F. Lang IV
Reg. No. 41,928
Attorney for Applicant

WFL:as